REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 23, 2008. Claims 1, 3, 6-10, 12, 15-19, 21, 24-27, 30-34, 36-41 and 57-59 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 19, 32-34 and 36-41, the independent claims, have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 10, 12, 15, 19, 21, 24, 31-34, 36-41 and 57-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 5,889,952 (Hunnicutt et al.) in view of U.S. Patents 6,848,106 (Hipp), 6,920,475 (Klots et al.) and 7,136,903 (Phillips et al.); Claims 7-9, 16-18, and 25-27, as being obvious from *Hunnicutt* in view of *Hipp*, *Klots* and *Phillips*, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,550,968 (Miller et al.); and Claim 30, as being obvious from *Hunnicutt* in view of *Hipp*, *Klots* and *Phillips*, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0028653 (New, Jr., et al.).

Applicants believe that their claims are allowable over the art cited against them, but have nonetheless amended the independent claims to make the distinctions still clearer.

Claim 1 is directed to an information processing method of controlling access to computer resource(s) managed by an operating system in a computer, wherein the method is implemented by a specific resource management program located between an operating system and an application. The method includes a storing step of storing a management table in a storage medium, wherein the management table provides, for each

computer resource managed by the operating system, access right information representing access rights for outputting each computer resource to another computer resource, and conditions under which the access right is validated. The method also includes an interception step of intercepting an operation request for a first computer resource from a process, before the operation request is transferred to the operating system, and if the process holds the first computer resource, registering a correspondence between the process and the first computer resource in a storage medium resulting in a registered process and a registered computer resource. The method further includes a determination step of monitoring a series of operation requests associated with the registered process and the registered computer resource to recognize when the series of operation requests, considered together, has the effect of outputting the registered computer resource to a second computer resource, retrieving from the management table first and second access right information, the first relating to the registered computer resource and the second relating to the second computer resource, and determining whether the registered process has both access rights, by checking the first and second access right information retrieved from the management table. The method also includes a processing step of, if it is determined in the determination step that the registered process has both access rights, transferring the operation request to the operating system and returning a result from the operating system to the registered process. In addition, the method includes a denial step of denying the operation request, if it is determined in the determination step that the registered process lacks either of the two access rights.

Among other notable features of Claim 1 therefore are (1) determining whether the registered process has an access right for outputting the registered computer resource to the second computer resource by checking the first access right information and the second access right information retrieved from the management table, (2) a processing step of transferring the operation request to the operating system and returning a result from the operating system to the registered process, if it is determined in said determination step that the registered process has the access rights of both the first access right information and the second access right information, and (3) a denial step of denying the operation request, if it is determined in the determination step that the registered process lacks either of the access rights of the first access right information and the second access right information.

Thus, transmission of an operation request is firstly allowed if a registered process has the access rights of both the first access right information and the second access right information.

The Office Action concedes *Hunnicutt* fails to disclose "an interception step" of Claim 1, for which newly cited *Hipp* is relied upon. Also, the Office Action agrees that *Hunnicutt* fails to disclose the "storing step" and the "determination step" of Claim 1, cut cites *Klots* and *Phillips*, respectively, for those features.

However, *Philips* has a client and server system for exchanging access request and response between a file server and a client node, in which the file server checks

an access right of the client node by using an operating system installed on the file server to control continuing or inhibiting of a process.

Further, *Hipp* relates to a virtual environment between the operating system and the application. A preload library in the virtual environment can save the state of various resources by intercepting API interface calls, and then saves the state at a pre-arranged memory location.

The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to use an arrangement like that in *Hipp* with an arrangement like that in *Philips*. Applicants respectfully point out, however, that the virtual arrangement in *Hipp* is ordinarily utilized for a stand-alone computer. In contrast, *Philips* is addressed to a client and server system. That those two patents both relate to computer technology is not sufficient to give a person of merely ordinary skill a reasont o consider combining them, and particularly since the *Hipp* system is a stand-alone computer, it would not have been obvious to use that patent's functions that pertain to the relation between the OS and an application, to handle access rights in a system like that of *Philips*.

Further, *Philips* does not teach or suggest the recited feature of determining whether a registered process has an access right for outputting the registered computer resource to a second computer resource by (1) checking first access right information and second access right information, and if it is determined that the registered process has access rights of both the first and second access right information, (2) transferring the

operation request to the operating system and returning a result from the operating system to the registered process.

Independent Claims 10, 19, 32-34, and 36-41 recite features similar in relevant respects to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1 and therefore are also believed to be patentable over *Hunnicutt*, *Hipp*, *Klots* and *Phillips* for at least the reasons discussed above.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. All of the independent claims are therefore believed patentable over the cited art.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2506997_1.DOC